

# The Ambient Horn: Designing a novel audio-based learning experience

CLIFF RANDELL

*Department of Computer Science, University of Bristol, Bristol, BS8 1UB, UK*

[cliff@compsci.bristol.ac.uk](mailto:cliff@compsci.bristol.ac.uk)

Fax: +44 117 9545208

Tel: +44 117 9545104

SARA PRICE, ERIC HARRIS, GERALDINE FITZPATRICK

*School of Informatics, University of Sussex, Brighton, BN1 9QH, UK*

{sarap, erich, geraldine}@sussex.ac.uk

Fax: +44 1273 671320

Tel: +44 1273 873179

YVONNE ROGERS

*School of Informatics, 901 East Tenth Street, Bloomington, Indiana, 47408-3912, USA*

[yrogers@indiana.edu](mailto:yrogers@indiana.edu)

Fax: +1 812-856-0999

Tel: +1 812-856-1095

**Abstract:** The Ambient Horn is a handheld audio device designed to support a novel learning experience for children learning about habitat distributions and interdependencies in an outdoor woodland environment. Children use the horn to listen to non-speech audio sounds that represent ecological processes. The sounds are triggered according to the children's location in the wood using short-range RF pingers. A main objective is to provoke children into interpreting and reflecting upon the significance of the sounds in the context in which they occur. Studies with pairs of children showed the sounds to be provocative, generating discussion about the different sounds and their relationship within the wood. In addition, children appropriated the horn in creative ways, trying to 'scoop' up new sounds as they walked in different parts of the woodland.

**Keywords:** *Augmented reality, mobile learning, pervasive computing, audio-based learning*

# 1. Introduction

Mixed reality environments, where the digital world is combined in some way with the physical world [7], provide opportunities to augment our experiences of the everyday world. Sensor-based devices can be triggered to deliver digital information through various human bodily movements in a variety of contexts - quite unlike those we are used to with conventional computer interfaces (e.g., VR, multimedia). One area where there is much potential for developing novel forms of experience is learning. In particular, active forms of learning can be encouraged, provoking children to stop, think and wonder, by combining the familiar with the unfamiliar, the expected with the unexpected [e.g. 1, 9, 13, 14, 18, 19, 22, 20].

Within this vein, the Ambient Wood was designed as a learning experience for children to discover, explore and reflect upon the complex processes that exist in a woodland ecology [23]. A woodland area was digitally enhanced through transforming it into a mixed reality environment. A number of digital representations of underlying physical processes were engineered to appear at contextually relevant times. These included images, sounds and videos conveying processes like photosynthesis and pollination. One of the main aims of developing this form of digital/physical augmentation is to provide abstractions relating to the 'hidden' processes of the woodland's ecology, not normally available to see, hear or have access to when walking around outdoors. Importantly, in doing so, our objective was not to bombard the children with excessive information while exploring the woodland, but to provide, at certain times, access to relevant knowledge that would enable the children to reflect upon the important factors and processes that underlie the woodland ecology.

A variety of devices were used to deliver and gain access to the digital augmentations, including PDAs, wireless speakers, a probing device for collecting readings and a periscope device. The design and evaluation of these are reported elsewhere [23, 25]. In this paper, we describe the design of a device called the Ambient Horn, a novel mobile sound delivery system that was developed for our latest version of the Ambient Wood learning experience. The Ambient Horn plays sounds at various locations in the wood, intended to represent ecological

processes that are normally inaudible and invisible, such as plant respiration, root uptake and bee pollination.

The reason for selecting these kinds of higher-level abstractions is that children tend not to think about them when engaged in their explorations of the ‘here and now’ of the woodland. We wanted to draw their attention at relevant times to what goes on behind the scenes and enable them to relate this to what they could see and hear with their own eyes and ears. In particular, we wanted them to notice various features of the woodland that would enable them to reflect on how these related to the abstract processes that lay behind them. In so doing, we needed to ensure that the actions involved in collecting and listening to the ambient sounds would not detract from the children’s interactions with the physical world. A key concern, therefore, was to determine whether the ongoing activity of exploring the woodland could be enhanced with unexpected augmented sounds. A further aim was to investigate the kinds of sounds that would be most effective at provoking children into reflecting and interpreting.

## **2. Relevant background**

Speech is fundamental to learning. Much educational research has focused on how best to support learning using different models of dialogue. Of interest here is how the use of *non-speech audio* can enhance learning. Many different kinds of abstract sounds can be created, based around the parameters of pitch, rhythm, intensity and timbre. These can be used in various ways and contexts: as an indicator that provides shift of emphasis in speech; as an interpreter of representations; as a ‘tap on the shoulder’ to gain attention to point out something of interest; and as a way of embellishing other experiences of an event that is happening or about to happen. Within HCI, non-speech audio has been used to augment conventional output devices such as a visual display, providing the user with audio cues for specific events. Such sounds are sometimes known as ‘earcons’ - “non-verbal audio messages that are used in the computer-user interface to provide information to the user about some computer object, operation or interaction” [3] and have been found to be particularly good at capturing a user’s attention whilst they are performing other tasks [5, 17].

Within learning contexts, non-speech audio has been used to make clearer and simpler certain kinds of complex information. For example, sound has been found to mediate understanding of large amounts of abstract data in complex systems, by marking differences in the data variables [4, 6] A particular form of non-speech audio that is used is ‘sonification’, defined by Kaper et al. [15] as the "faithful rendition of data into sounds", where abstract sound variables are parameterized by modifying their frequency, amplitude and duration to map data, often happening in real time. Sounds used for sonification are normally composed of synthesized tones and have been shown to be effective at helping undergraduate students learn about molecular properties when used in combination with 3D visualizations [11].

As when designing any kind of representation – be it visual, auditory or other – an important concern is what form to use and how this maps onto the underlying referent. The kinds of mapping used can be arbitrary, symbolic or direct [21]. An example of an arbitrary mapping is of a ‘tong’ sound to represent happiness. There is no relationship between the two. Equally, a ‘ting’ could have been used. An example of a symbolic mapping is the sound of glass smashing to represent fragility. Here the sound conveys an underlying referent that is at a higher level of abstraction than the sound itself. An example of a direct mapping is of a clapping sound used to represent clapping. The sound resembles the action and can be readily interpreted in the way it is meant to be. For some kinds of referents it is relatively easy to design sounds that have direct mappings. For other kinds of referent, however, especially those that are abstract (e.g. radiation), it is difficult to design representations that have direct mappings. In these instances arbitrary representations have to be used (although over time some of them become universally understood such as the symbol of overlapping broken circles to represent radiation).

Gaver’s [12] *auditory icons*, developed as part of the SonicFinder (an experimental operating system for the Mac interface) mainly used direct mappings. A set of auditory icons was created to represent actions performed on various interface objects. They were intended to semantically map onto naturally occurring sounds that would be heard if the same actions were performed with

counterpart physical objects. For example, the sound of ‘think’ was used to represent dropping a file into a folder and ‘crash’ for deleting an object when dropped into the trashcan. In this interface context, the non-speech sounds were used to emulate, in an exaggerated form, physical actions, and in so doing providing feedback to alert the user’s attention to various interface events. Other research into non-speech audio has used more arbitrary mappings, for example, the use of various musical sounds to help users debug when programming [10].

We were interested in whether different kinds of symbolic and arbitrary mappings, that use abstract sounds to represent abstract processes, can promote reflection in children. Our objective was to trigger curiosity and discussion among the children as to what the sounds signified and how they related this to what they could see and hear around them. Thus, we designed an audio based learning experience using a variety of arbitrary, symbolic and direct mappings.

### **3. Design of the audio based learning experience**

In our first design of the Ambient Wood learning experience [23] a number of digital sounds were pervasively presented to the children. Whenever they moved to a location in the woodland where a RF pinger is hidden, their bodily presence triggered a sound that was played through nearby wireless loudspeakers, also hidden. This design was aimed at giving a richer experiential texture to the learning experience where digital sounds of woodland organisms were added to the natural environment. These included: animal sounds (e.g. bird singing, caterpillar eating, butterfly drinking nectar) and plant sounds (e.g. thistle dying, grass rustling, leaves decomposing). One goal of using this pervasive technique was to provide an element of surprise. If the children walked past a hidden beacon, a particular sound would be triggered, but the children would be unaware when this might happen and what caused it. This technique was intended to stop the children in their tracks and figure out what the sound signified and why it had happened. Moreover, we wanted the sound to draw the children’s attention to aspects of the habitat they might not otherwise notice, providing relevant contextual information that they could integrate with their experience. For example, if the children walked past a certain bush that attracted butterflies a sound of a butterfly drinking nectar would be played. The aim was for children to

reflect upon this unusual sound and work out the interdependency between the flowering of the bush and the butterflies feeding upon it.

However, preliminary findings of the first Ambient Wood trials showed that the ambient sounds provided in this manner appeared to “fit” into the setting so well that they were hardly ever noticed by the children. Even when a facilitator (who stayed close by the children during their explorations) drew their attention to the sounds after they had been played, the children would look somewhat puzzled, having not heard them. This raises the question of whether our original design of ambient sounds was in fact too ambient that they were simply not heard among the ‘noise’ of the other naturally occurring sounds in the wood. Most of the time, the children were simply too engrossed in other things to even notice a sound [23]. Kilander and Lönnqvist [16] consider the “subtle difference between the anticipated and the perceived” suggesting the importance of understanding the meaning of the effect (in this case, sound). If sound is perceived as meaningful then the effect is to attract attention, whereas anticipated sound merely ‘fades into the background’.

### **3.1 The design of the Ambient Horn**

To overcome the ‘noise’ problem of the children missing the pervasively delivered sounds we decided in a subsequent design of Ambient Wood to give the children control over the playing of the sounds, where they have to physically interact with a handheld device in order to listen to them. The Ambient Horn, was designed to still maintain the effect of surprise by the apparent serendipitous triggering of digital information (still using location pingers), but also enabling the children to choose exactly when to play the sounds. A simple interface was designed, using indicator lights to alert children to the presence of a sound and a button to enable children to play (and replay) the sound. Thus, the sounds were still accessible in a contextually relevant part of the wood, but the horn enabled the sounds to be kept ‘on hold’ until the children themselves were ready to listen to them. This way, the children could remain engrossed in their ongoing activities until one of them noticed that a sound had been triggered ready to be played.

The original design concept for the Ambient Horn was to acquire real or plastic horns in accordance with nature and the woodland environment (see Figure 1).

However, horns such as these were not large enough to house the envisaged technology. In earlier trials we observed children's fascination for novel technology and believed that a technically overt design would be more engaging.



Figure 1. Original horns used as inspiration for the design concept

We wished to retain the organic element of the natural horn and at the same time introduce an obvious technological component. The first prototype we built was the Box-Horn ('box+horn'), attempting both to echo the organic shape of the natural horn, and at the same time provide an interesting technical object. An MP3 player was mounted inside the white box, two red Light Emitting Diodes (LEDs) flash when a location ping is received by the horn and the sound is played through the metal horn by operating a push button (figure 2).



Figure 2. The Box Horn prototype

The Box Horn prototype was found to be unsatisfactory because of its size (being too large for small children to operate conveniently) and limited control functions. Anything beyond pushing the play button required the case to be opened. To overcome these drawbacks, the Techno-Horn was developed (figure 3). Here, the MP3 player was positioned outside the box providing a smaller and much more

visible ‘techy’ solution with the possibility that the children could operate the player themselves as well as having sounds automatically cued. The horn itself was again used as a speaker housing.



Figure 3. The Techno Horn prototype

However, trials with this prototype showed the device to be bulky and awkward for the children to operate while moving around. The remote cueing of the MP3 player required 1 second per track, e.g. 12 seconds to cue track 12, providing delays which reduced the spontaneity of the device’s performance. This design also required children to learn the additional functions of the MP3 player.

To overcome these limitations the MP3 player was replaced with a customised sound chip. This reduced the overall size of the device, and enabled a bespoke interface to be incorporated instead of using the proprietary design. Although the specification of the sound chip is more limiting than a MP3 player (with only 60 seconds of monophonic audio available) the speed of response is almost instant, and by using looping techniques we could provide an equivalent range of sounds to those previously played by the MP3 player.

The final design of the Ambient Horn was intended to be simple to operate, compact to hold easily in one hand, and robust for outdoor mobile use. The horn emits a distinct beep when a ping is received, drawing attention to the presence of a sound. In addition, two LEDs, integrated into the horn, continue to flash until the sound is played. If the children miss the beep or wish to continue with what they are doing the LED lights act as a reminder that a sound is waiting. A push button triggers the sound to be played. In accordance with the design of the activity, a rotary switch was built onto the device to access two alternate sets of



sounds (one focusing on plant processes and the other on animal activities). The horn was also fitted with a drawstring so that it could be worn on the body as a pendant, freeing up the child's hands to use other devices (e.g. the walkie-talkie or PDA). When worn, like this the LED lights are visible for the other child to notice and initiate collaboration in its use.




Figure 4. The final design of the Ambient Horn

To enable the Horn to trigger the sounds in context the receiver was engineered to detect proximity to location pingers. The set up was designed such that when the children moved out of a designated pinger area, but then came back into the same area, they received again the sound associated with that pinger.

The location pingers had a range of 10 meters and were deployed at various points of interest in the wood such as in thistle patches and reed beds. The Ambient Horn itself generated a ping signal every time it was used to enable a record to be kept of its usage by creating notifications of events to a network server as they happened. These pings were processed via a bodyworn local receiver attached to a wirelessly networked PDA. The wireless network provided coverage for the total area of the wood explored by the children. This was achieved using three access points running on the IEEE 802.11b standard and supplied a backbone to which the Horn and the other Ambient Wood devices could connect.

### 3.2 The design of the sounds

Similar to the design rationale for the first Ambient Wood trials, our aim was to design a set of sounds to be played with the Ambient Horn that could facilitate children's reflection and discussion as to their meaning and significance. Abstract animations have been found to promote reflection, creativity and imagination in children [18]. Likewise, we assumed that abstract sounds could provoke reflection, by requiring the children to interpret the sounds based on what they know and what they see around them. To this end we chose a variety of sounds to represent a range of ecological processes that take place in the woodland; processes that are invisible to the naked eye, but are contextually relevant for understanding habitat interdependencies.

	Process	Sound	Mapping	Clearing /wooded
<b>Plant-based</b>	Photosynthesis	Light sabre sound	Arbitrary	C + W
	Respiration	Fireworks	Arbitrary	C + W
	Root uptake	Water slurp	Symbolic	C + W
	Decomposition	Paper rustling	Arbitrary	C + W
<b>Animal-based</b>	Squirrel eating	Breaking nuts	Symbolic	W
	Woodlice moving	Fast tapping	Symbolic	W
	Caterpillar eating	Chomping	Symbolic	C + W
	Bird singing	Chiff-chaff/nuthatch	Direct	C + W
	Bee pollinating	Rasp	Symbolic	C
	Butterfly feeding	Water suck	Symbolic	C

Table 1. Sounds recorded on the Horn

We used three kinds of mappings, namely arbitrary, symbolic and direct. An example of an arbitrary mapping was the use of an energy kind of sound (like a light sabre) to represent photosynthesis. Here our aim was to provoke children into understanding the factors involved in photosynthesis, identifying the different aspects that were visible to them in the woodland. An example of a symbolic mapping was the use of the sound of chomping to represent animal eating behaviour, at a higher level of abstraction than the sound itself. Here, we hoped

that alerting the children to a general class of behaviour would increase their exploration or enquiry into the possibilities of a variety of organisms inhabiting that particular location. Direct mappings were used to draw attention to creatures that tend to disappear with human presence (e.g. birds), but that are important for understanding habitat interdependencies. A total of 10 sounds were created to support learning in two different habitats, an open clearing and a dense wooded area. Children could receive up to eight sounds relevant for their habitat; four plant-based and four animal-based. The type of sound, the habitat, the mapping used and underlying process being represented are shown in table 1. A limited number of sounds like this precludes the audio from becoming a dominant activity in the learning experience.

## **4. Experiences with the Ambient Horn and sounds**

The Ambient Wood was intended to promote a range of learning experiences, based around the process of scientific enquiry. It involved pairs of children collecting, probing, exploring, hypothesizing and evaluating and comparing their findings. Details of the learning outcomes are reported elsewhere [23]. Of interest, here, is how the children used the horn in their exploration of the woodland. To promote further reflection on what they had just heard the children were required to report their findings to a remote facilitator, using a walkie-talkie. This was intended to encourage them to articulate their discoveries at another level of description, forcing them to be explicitly aware of their own and one another's understanding. Once the sound has been discussed with the remote facilitator further information could be sent by the facilitator (e.g. an image) onto a PDA, they were also carrying with them.

### **4.1 Use of the horn**

Twelve pairs of children, aged 11-12 years old, used the Ambient Horn. Overall, the horn proved to be successful for augmenting learning, acting as a tool to promote reflection, interpretation and further exploratory activity in the woodland. The children found it easy to use, requiring little explanation or training. They found it to be engaging, and showed great interest and eagerness to listen to sounds. Several children expressed enjoyment, e.g. pointing out to the other one "listen to that!"

The children intuitively interacted with the horn itself in a variety of ways. Some pairs of children held it to their ear to listen to the sound as might be expected. In these instances they took it in turn to listen to the sound, with sometimes one child holding it for the other child to hear. Other pairs chose not to hold the horn to their ear, but held it in front of them, enabling both children to listen at the same time. The design allowed children to collaboratively engage with the device and encouraged good sharing practice (figure 4). The horn was also used well in conjunction with the other devices the children had. The facility to hang it around the neck left their hands free for other devices, such as PDA and walkie-talkies, and its shape and size enabled easy grasping in one hand, allowing easy transferring between children.



Figure 4: Using the horn to listen to sounds

The horn was successful in attracting children's attention to the information received via it. When the horn 'beeped' the students often stopped immediately and listened to the sound that was played. The sounds and the horn thus acted as good attention grabbers. However, when the children were already engaged in other activities in the wood (e.g. probing for light or moisture) when a sound arrived, the children often continued with what they were doing before listening to the sound. There were also times when the child carrying the horn was engrossed in e.g. talking with the remote facilitator on the walkie-talkie, and the other child having noticed the LEDs flashing, was the one to initiate interaction with the horn. Our studies, therefore, suggest that marking the arrival of a sound with a 'beep', 'storing' sounds, and using LEDs in this way, supported the children in managing the, sometimes, large amounts of simultaneous pieces of information.

Although the horn was designed to receive sounds triggered by pingers according to location, many of the children used the horn in unanticipated ways to interact

with their environment (figure 5). Some perceived it as an instrument that could *collect* sounds. Their actions suggest that they appropriated the tool as a collecting device, choosing what kinds of things to hear, for example, taking it to different plants, thus, naturally associating a sound with an item or object. Several children also made scooping actions with it through the air, as if to catch a sound, exploring different places where they might get sounds. One child interestingly used the verb to ‘take’ when talking with her peer “shall we take another sound?” Another pair of children used it to try to find out more about the woodland. After hearing the photosynthesis sound he held the horn over a leaf in the sunshine as if to see whether photosynthesis was taking place.



Figure 5: Using the horn in intuitive ways

#### **4.2 Reflection and interpretation of the sounds**

Our observations of the children discussing the sounds with each other and the remote facilitator showed evidence of attempts to relate what they had heard with what they saw around them and the implications of this in relation to the ecological processes. The most effective sounds at triggering this kind of reflection among the children were those with symbolic mappings. For example, children explored the relationship between the habitat characteristics and the sound they received. One pair of children in the clearing area reflecting on the sound they received. One pair of children in the clearing area reflecting on the root uptake sound (a water- related sound) interpreted this to represent rain. They reasoned that rain was a relevant feature for this habitat as it could easily come through into the clearing area because there were no trees to provide shelter.

Children also explored ideas of events in the wood relating to the sound representing photosynthesis, by reflecting upon the relationship between the sun and plant behaviour. One pair of children, prompted by the remote facilitator to

think about the root uptake sound in relation to their moisture readings inferred a particular location in the habitat to be more moist because they had received more root uptake sounds than the photosynthesis sound. This indicated to them the presence of more moisture than sunlight. Here the children are relating quantity of sound to quantity of physical attributes in the wood. This is an interesting inference, and suggests ways in which sound can be modified and used to represent other relevant attributes of the woodland, that would support children's understanding of habitat distributions.

However, at times the children found it hard to perceive sounds as being 'representational' across a general class of species rather than concrete. For example, sounds that were intended to 'represent' animals-in-general eating, were taken to relate to one species, rather than being representative of several. It was almost as if once they had associated a particular animal to a general class behaviour it was hard to imagine it being otherwise. Mapping the sound to the 'general' may increase the exploration or enquiry into the possibilities of a variety of animals inhabiting that particular location. One way of achieving this might be to have one sound linked to several relevant images sent to their PDA, widening the possible mappings that children make. This might also support them in thinking about the most likely organism for the habitat that they are currently in, whether those other animals would be there and if not why not.

The children found it much harder to interpret the more arbitrary mappings in terms of matching the sounds to the processes that were intended. For example, the arbitrary sounds representing photosynthesis (deep synthsed throbbing) and decomposition (crackling sound) were not as easy to interpret as the more symbolic sounds, e.g., the slurping sound used to represent root uptake. At one level, this suggests it is easier for the children to make the connection between a referent that can be imagined sonically (e.g. root uptake) and a sound they are familiar with (slurping) than a hard to imagine abstract process represented by an arbitrary sound. Children also tended to make symbolic interpretations of arbitrary sounds, for example, interpreting the 'photosynthesis' sound to be an aeroplane. However, it can be difficult to represent symbolically certain kinds of abstract processes in an auditory form. We would argue that in some ways this may not be

so problematic as the use of an arbitrary mapping can provoke other kinds of interpretation. Even though the children found it hard to understand the relationship between the sound and referent, the more arbitrary sounds promoted guessing and providing multiple interpretations. Once explained by the facilitator, it also got them looking around at aspects of the woodland to point out the different elements involved in that process. For example, for photosynthesis, the children provided explanations of the process, using features of the environment, including the sun and leaves.

## **Conclusions**

Designing a device to deliver contextually relevant information in the form of sound provided significant benefits over delivering sound pervasively within the environment. Providing a mixture of pervasive delivery with direct control over accessing the sounds was successful in overcoming the problem of children missing sounds altogether due to noise. Moreover, collecting and listening to sounds in this way enhanced rather than interfered with their ongoing activity. This design allowed the children to access sounds at a suitable time for their activity rather than requiring their immediate attention, as was the case with the environmental speakers, and which interrupts current activity. The horn also provided a novel way of thinking about ecological processes through the use of different kinds of sounds. The various mappings provoked different kinds of reflection and interpretation. Symbolic sounds facilitated reflection about invisible organisms or processes and interpretation in relation to the environment, while the direct mappings succeeded in drawing attention to present, but not visibly obvious creatures. Although the arbitrary sounds were hardest to interpret and imagine, they nonetheless provoked the children to think about underlying processes.

### **Acknowledgements.**

This work has been carried out through the EPSRC-funded EQUATOR Interdisciplinary Research Collaboration ([www.equator.ac.uk](http://www.equator.ac.uk)). We would particularly like to thank our partners from Sussex (especially Rowanne Fleck), Southampton, Bristol and Nottingham, and participating teachers and pupils from Varndean School, Brighton. Further support was provided by Hewlett Packard's Art and Science programme.

## References

1. Ackerman, E. (1996) Perspective-Taking and Object Construction: Two Keys to Learning. In (eds) Y. Kafai and M. Resnick *Constructionism in Practice: Designing, Thinking and Learning in a Digital World*. Lawrence Erlbaum, NJ.
2. Beaudouin-Lafon, M. and Gaver, W. (1994) ENO: Synthesizing Structured Sound Spaces. *Seventh Annual Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology* ACM
3. Blattner, M., Sumikawa, D. and Greenberg, R. (1989) Earcons and icons: Their structure and common design principles. *Human Computer Interaction* 4, 1, 11-44.
4. Brewster, S.A. (1994) Providing a structured method for integrating non-speech audio into human-computer interfaces. PhD Thesis, University of York, UK, 1994.
5. Brewster, S.A., Wright, P.C. and Edwards, A.D.N. (1993) An evaluation of earcons for use in auditory human-computer interfaces. In *Proceedings of InterCHI'93 (Amsterdam)* ACM Press, Addison-Wesley, 1993, pp. 222-227.
6. Childs, E. (2001) The Sonification of Numerical Fluid Flow Simulations. *Proceedings of the 2001 International Conference on Auditory Display*, Finland 2001.
7. Drascic, D. and Milgram, P. (1996) Perceptual issues in augmented reality. *SPIE: Stereoscopic Displays and Virtual Reality Systems III*, Volume 2653, Editors: Mark T. Bolas, Scott S. Fisher, John O. Merritt San Jose, California, USA, January - February 1996, pp 123-134
8. Evard, R. (1993) Collaborative networked communication: MUDs as System tools. *Proceedings of Seventh Systems Administration Conference (LISA VII)*, (1993) 1-8.
9. Forrester, D. and Jantzie, N. (2000) [http://www.ucalgary.ca/~gnjantzi/learning\\_theories.htm](http://www.ucalgary.ca/~gnjantzi/learning_theories.htm)
10. Francioni, J.M., Allbright, L., and Jackson, J.A. (1992) Debugging parallel programs using sound. *SIG-PLAN Notices*, 26(12), 68-75.
11. Garcia-Ruiz, M.A. (2001). Using non-speech sounds to convey molecular properties in a virtual environment *International Conference of New Technologies in Science Education (CINTEC)*, Aveiro, Portugal, 4-6 July 2001.
12. Gaver, W. (1986) Auditory icons: Using sound in computer interfaces, *Human-Computer Interaction*, 2, 1986, 167-177
13. Hoyles, C. and Noss, R. (1999) Playing with (and without) words. *Proceedings of the seventh European Logo Conference Eurologo '99* Sofia, Bulgaria, 18-29.
14. Ishii, H., and Ullmer, B. (1997). "Tangible bits: Towards seamless interfaces between people, bits and atoms." *Proceedings of CHI'97*. ACM Press. 234-241.
15. Kaper, H. G., Tipei S, Wiebel, E. (1999) Data sonification and sound visualization, *Computing in Science and Engineering*, 1(4), 48-58.
16. Kilander, F. and Lönnqvist, P. (2002) A Whisper in the Woods – An Ambient Soundscape for Peripheral Awareness of Remote Processes. *Proceedings of the 2002 International Conference on Auditory Display*, Japan 2002.
17. McGookin, D. and Brewster, S.A. *An Investigation into the Identification of Concurrently Presented Earcons*. In *Proceedings of ICAD 2003 (Boston, MA)*. ICAD.
18. Price, S., Rogers, Y., Scaife, M., Stanton, D. & Neale, H. (2003a) 'Using 'tangibles' to promote novel forms of playful learning'. *Interacting with Computers*, 15/2, May 2003, pp 169-185.
19. Price, S., Rogers, Y., Stanton, D., and Smith, H. (2003b) A New Conceptual Framework for CSCL: Supporting Diverse Forms of Reflection through Multiple Interactions. In (eds) B. Wasson, S. Ludvigsen, U. Hoppe, *Designing for Change in Networked Learning Environments. Proceedings of the International Conference on Computer Supported Collaborative Learning 2003*.



20. Resnick, M. (2003). Thinking Like a Tree (and Other Forms of Ecological Thinking) *.International Journal of Computers for Mathematical Learning* , vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 43-62.
21. Rogers, Y. (1989) Icons at the interface: their usefulness. *Interacting with Computers* , 1, 105-118
22. Rogers, Y., Scaife, M., Harris, E., Phelps, T., Price, S., Smith, H., Muller, H., Randell, C., Moss, A., Taylor, I., Stanton, D., O'Malley, C., Corke, G. & Gabrielli, S. (2002a) Things aren't what they seem to be: innovation through technology inspiration. *Proceedings of DIS2002*, London, 25-28 June, 373-377
23. Rogers, Y., Price, S., Harris, E., Phelps, T., Underwood, M., Wilde, D. & Smith, H. (2002b) Learning through digitally-augmented learning experiences: Reflections on the Ambient Wood project. (*Equator technical report*)
24. Somers, E. (2000) Abstract Sound Objects to Expand the Vocabulary of Sound Design for Visual and Theatrical Media. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Auditory Display*. Georgia USA
25. Wilde, D. (2003) The Periscope: Supporting a Computer Enhances Field Trip for Children. *First International Conference on Appliance Design, Bristol May 2003*